SOCIETY

BOOK 1

SABOON MAK3R

FEBRUARY 20, 2019

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this first book is not to imagine a society, nor theorize about what would a virtuous elevated elite look like. There won't be an imaginary ought-to-be, because there can't be a flawless setting to host it. Any ideal world will be an overly simplistic projection of what really is. The exercise rather consists of being rational in regards to the complex nature of humans, and the way how they can reflect their complexity in building their societies overtime. This would be an introspection about what a human society is, and what it might want to be in today's setting. The proposition of living without technology will be quickly considered as unfeasible because it predates human well-being. Technology in its abstract form helps to do better what human-made systems are supposed to do best, which is self-preservation and expansion according to the most radical system theories*.

In the world where technology is not absent but rather omni-present, the incentives and objectives of self-preservation and expansion of these human systems must be reviewed and re-aligned. The machines will accelerate whatever is fed into them. Thus, the objective of this text is to synthesize what a post-modern society might want to become, given the hard-coded irrationality of human nature, and the apparent dichotomy between individual and general well-beings.

---

* *A neo-Luddite manifesto? How society should respond to the uncertainty of a technological future: https://thetech.com/2016/11/10/anti-tech-revolution-book-review*

1 A MACHINE

MACHINE-DEFINED SOCIETY Functionally, modern technology defines the world we evolve-in.

We are surrounded by machines that “improve” – if not accelerate – our daily lives to the extent that we forget their non-absence. For instance, machines are built on simplistic conceptual models, supported by legitimately complex mathematical proof, that reflect the actual state of knowledge and progress humanity can achieve so far. This accumulated knowledge is projected in our quotidien in very simple manners. If today you used your car, received a call, or paid with your card, you used a single machine, or an interconnected set of machines.

However, more often than not, many would understand progress in technology as if it was an inevitable continuum, instead of understanding it in its scientific context, where progress is incremental, and where failures to use technology for non-destrutive purposes, most often than not, can’t be reversed.

2 AN INTERNET

SYSTEMIC INTERCONNECTION Machines speak Mathematics, the divine language some would argue, or at least the language that the creator mastered to create our world. Through applied mathematics, humanity seems to get closer to achieve the medieval[1] ideal of collective mind, or an universal intellect[2], that one can reach out-to by connecting to the bottomless internet.

Those interconncted machines harvest input, and today they are extremely proficient at collecting and archiving the present ideas that humans feed into their websites, emails, text messages and phone calls. Even the way users interact with the devices themselves is collected and analyzed[3]. What one really sees on his screens is the endless flow of collective, and intrinsically human contributions to the collective knowledge, that built up over a very large time frame, as if it was an open-ended library. The concept of library is not really new, however the way this library serves text does evolve. The rigid criteria of Inclusiveness requires a low-barrier to publish on these shelves, thus the reader must not be surprised by the amount of rubbish the library can contain. The Internet itself brings a load of information that is, or can be similar to knowledge[4], which implies that the internet’s user will be the sole judge of the veracity and integrity of what he sees, reads or listens to.

Technology exacerbates this original concept of universality of the intellect, so it becomes visible bursts and branches of new thoughts, that branch out of each other, grab their “potential” and realize their “essence” from the general air of floating ideas, without necessarily acquiring a physical body. By taking over computation, machines thereby absorb the complexity of our interactions, seamlessly, and inevitably act as a catalyst reflecting and propagating the nature of any kind of input dumped into them. Machines are powerful in their consistency and their efficiency despite the cradle of technology, it being permanently broken. Soon enough though, the same broken machines will be capable to feed us the images, sounds and texts that reproduce the world, as they think we believe it is.

To acquire a more abstract understanding of the interaction between technology and humanity, one might equate machines to toddlers who reflect a candid projection of the direct environment around them. Be it, these toddlers are very powerful. Their power can be efficiently applied to erode the trust that their parents, the creators, harnessed to progress.

In this interlaced setting, human societies must start asking the relevant questions in order to progress in it:

Q1 For a given machine-defined society what would be an ideal safe space?

Q2 Does such space exist? And if not, what prevents it from existing?

Q3 How does irrational behavior and humanity get interpreted in the mechanical world of machines?

Q4 What is the definition of compassion and empathy, and *in absentia* how would humans interact with each other, and towards their environment?

Q5 If novel techniques to connect with each other are available, what framework will host the interactions?

Based on these questions, and if this essay pretends to provide a small set of solutions to individuals and communities, it is necessary to know who are those individuals and who are those social groups; and specifically understand how they create and propagate ideas using the available technology.

3 A SYSTEM

THE WORLD FOR A FALLACY In our attempts to grasp the truth of our world, it is tempting to proceed to a systemic analysis where we can eventually decompose the different layers, or classes[5], into systems and sub-systems, and see societies from this narrow alley as a set of everlasting fighting entities[6], playing an endless game.

Systemics is the dialectical field par-excellence that system theorists, psychologists and economists contribute to, even though such analysis will always, and inevitably, end up dividing human groups into competing classes and categories among obscure sub-systems, sometimes self-fulfilling the suggested isolation of the identified groups, and causing the accelerated erosion of the necessary empathy that drives social bonding. After all, technology always provides from within itself a competitive advantage that can be well used to win a competition. In this, human-made technical systems do not behave like organic organisms in which the notion of infinite competition is mostly absent. If any system is hosted in a “competition” setting, and players presume that their potential for growth and expansion is infinite, they will inevitably heat up, create bubbles, implode or explode, because of the limitation and inaccuracy of the assumptions. These are the main assumptions behind contemporary capitalism, and it is applied to all of the lateral fields when everything bares an intrinsic financial value. The organicity of organic systems is veiled, because it does not fit with the constraints of competitions and systems theory, despite an instinctive tendency of organic systems like humans to not-destroy what is surrounding them, and a natural inclination to relate to each other. Forests, trees, animals, humans and living things will only be seen as assets or nuisance for the main player, if not themselves players in a fallacious “natural” competition to survive.

Now that humans’ destruction capabilities are established, the competition framework will only lead to generalized, or total destruction. Climate change will drastically intoxicate today’s tensions. On the positive side of things, models of non-competition and socially-responsible systems do exist.

4 A NON-COMPETITION

NATURAL DISORDER Forests are not competing systems, even though a forest would prevail and expand if allowed to.

When there were no humans the flora systems did not attempt to suck all of the resources of the planet, nor started franchises, nor built rockets to plant planet Mars. Those extravagant efforts would have been futile for an organic organism. To persist, a forest will continuously adapt and change from within, and towards the outside world, until people come and cut the trees, pollute the soil, or drastically alter the environment, so the forest dies. To stretch the analogy, we still did not witness trees gathering at international conferences to agree on a common answer, to behave in synergy and stop abusing the available resources upstream and downstream of their lifetime. A tree is not capable of intellect, and yet it would still be able to not abuse its environment, and thrive.

It is certain that this analogy might seem, and is, absurd. But this absurdity does not reach the levels of men destroying the only livable environment they can afford. For system theorists groups of trees are systems, that contain sub-systems, which must collectively aim to self-preserve and expand. Provably, those same trees, reacting as self-expanding systems will naturally be inclined to persist over time, however they would not over-use the resources of their soil, and not without giving back a marginally equal amount of energy to fertilize the soil, filter the air, and enable diversity in its immediate ecosystem.

No trees were hurt in the process.

5 A DIVISION

UNDEFINED ELEMENT The argument proposed here is that the models we use today to understand human interactions and societies are dangerously limited; thus the technology in-hands ends up promoting the most divisive perception, when this perception is more lucrative for the group with the latest technology, even though it suffers from a deep dichotomy from its immediacy, and remotely relates to what really is.

The pretext for the promotion of a divisive abstracted view might change over time, depending of factors like wealth, education and level of technology, but it continuously results in the entrenchment of certain groups into what they define as their identity, be it ethnic, financial or any seemingly invisible but consensual identity like nationality or religion. The fallacious assumptions that social groups, once divided in systemic categories are impermeable to each other, thus persists.

A contrasted opinion would argue that a systemized approach can be useful in a specific scientific context. But once the theory gets out of this specific academic context, it dangerously abstracts the human - and humane - element, despite it being the main ingredient that constitutes the kernel of any society. In this, the sanctity of the human element is simply ignored, in such systems, because it becomes exogenous, thus irrelevant. For instance, the same way the human is the kernel of the society, the tree is the necessary kernel of the forest, but not necessarily its center, nor its sole player or sub-system.

Humans must understand, via their use of technology and observation of their organic environment, that the element that constitutes the essence of the human kind – their humanity – is nothing else but their organicity, their irrationality, and their painful tendency to assimilation and fear of rejection. In other words, the very traits that simplistic models are not capable of replicating.

Let us suppose that systemic (self-)perception, like language, will necessarily provide an incomplete version, or a partial picture, of what really is. In this, if humans become capable of considering their limited perception of themselves as a whole "ensemble", will they try to understand their own fragile and yet non-simplistic humanity in some form of objectivity; and if so, will they do it before creating a necessarily candid version of what they think is an? humanity That is equation that this essay will not reply to, thus avoid laying out the highly speculative nature of the possible conculsions.

6 A GROUP

MECHANICAL CONTRACT A society can be understood if one understands how it creates ideas[7], and if it succeeds to spread these ideas, and promotes the value system that hosts them.

Human groups, with or without technology, can be very harmful to each other for the sake of land, blood, belief or whatever can become a pretext for the masses. Besides a thin layer of antique - and philosophically sound - ethics, there are no to few boundaries to using humans against each other, as a form of self-enrichment, or for the purpose of alienating a number of individuals. We can call it capitalism, imperialism, slavery, colonialism or applied game theory. Practically, in today's setting, the most prominent threat of a group towards another group, is the looming danger of surveillance capitalism, always at a very frightening proximity. Corporations are heavily invested to understand how they apply machines to identify, track and enforce behavioral patterns upon their users. When humans are enticed or lured to behave like machines, they will willingly follow a determined pattern of un-critiqued and ignorant "bliss".

Consequently, in the continuity of this psycho-technical abuse, the aftermath of the digital shift is not a miracle, especially in regards to privacy, freedom and distribution of wealth, but rather is expected to see a generalization of whatever is fed to it.

7 A FEEDBACK-LOOP

UNPREDICT One of the best ways to learn about the Internet is to observe the youngest generation of internet natives. They tend to understand quickly the set of connected tools, and would use it in a less tampered way since they don't necessarily inherit the usage from their elders.

The youth are the future adults who will face the consequences of today's mistakes, and today's decision making must acknowledge, for the least, that it can't fairly predict the feedback loops that will affect the next generations, sometimes dramatically. Acknowledging this incapacity would shift the question to a more practical realm where future risks are conceptually minimized, especially for a society which heavily relies on computer systems to transmit communications.

In a future safer environment, one will be more comfortable to argue in favor of more openness towards the internet, and more inclusiveness in using it. There is an incentive to use more bandwith. One would also be more free to acquire an understanding of the ways information circulates between individuals today, so it can still be safe in the future, and continuously.

In the meanwhile as things are, no one can guarantee today that the information available now, held by states and corporations, will not be used in an adversarial future setting. The default expectation towards these actors is that the usage of this data, by its owners, is certain and opaque.

8 A DYSTOPIA

FORWARD INTEGRITY We are all exposed to a new mis-qualified risk, as any real computer-based dystopia will be much more resilient, and more vicious than any previous form of totalitarian regime. The centralization and gate-keeping is equally destructive when applied by politicians and/or shareholders.

The fox is in the henhouse, since it is not possible anymore to acquire a privacy from the many devices that surround us at any given moment. It is not a marginal risk, but rather a systemic one. Our seamless personal assistants are interconnected machines that serve granular and accurate information to other people, or groups of people. The infrastructure of interconnected machines exists in an imperfect form which makes it subject to continuous exploitation, and will keep existing unless we face a major catastrophe that would throw us decades behind, to inevitably slow the expansion process of the internet, but not stop it. Thus, today's complex environment is the setting where we must review the institutions of states, political regimes and corporations who actually partake in this exploitation, when they certainly are less resilient and will inevitably rise and fall. These institutions are the ones that must re-align their incentives with the physical security of the future generations of the communities they serve, and they must consider the usage of their data and technology in a setting where they have to withdraw, resign, bankrupt, or get ousted by other groups.

Future generations must be shielded from today's uninformed decisions, so internet natives can retroactively protect themselves from us, and from their past selves by default. To succeed in the near future there is no way around the promotion of constructive critical thought, and extensive encryption throughout our communication and trade systems. These two systems, once free from corporate and political invasiveness, are the ones that will guarantee a fair distribution of education and wealth for internet's users.

9 AN EPOCH

EXISTENTIAL MISBEHAVIOR Despite the ambient permanent noise of wireless transmissions, postmodern societies find themselves amidst a large scale cultural crisis, as they drown in intellectual draught and stagnation. It is not about the leaders, not anymore than about the neo-hedo-sufis, crypto-capitalists, and advocates of free markets that prevail over the free humans.

In an overly sensitive environment, self-introspection and supposedly high levels of intra-personal self-enlightenment become outrageous unsound pretexts to not mobilize and ignore the fox in the room. The global challenges ahead will overwhelm advanced and united nations. It will very certainly affect irreversibly the private lives of isolated persons, especially the most vulnerable, and the unprepared.

Our natural environment is threatened by humans' very existence and behavior, as geologists and philosophers call it the Anthropocene epoch[8]. Natural catastrophes will intensify: Rising of sea levels, heatwaves, cold waves, delayed seasons, floods, environmental refugees, and the unforeseen climate-change feedback loops. Because of post-cold-war capitalism, the profits generated from this massive pollution and abuse are privatized, and the consequences handed over to the public and their future progeniture. Because of technology, the "techie" in San Francisco affects the populations, on a massive scale, without being liable for the souls affected under other jurisdictions.

10 A KNOWLEDGE

CYBERNETIC ETHICS The internet already affects our value systems as ethnicities, citizens, nationals and transnationals, and our children will be directly exposed to these newly shared value systems.

In today's context where communication is consistently present in most inhabited areas, knowledge itself becomes resilient and available. Collaborative endeavors do not require travelling anymore, and the marginal cost of starting an international venture to serve a transnational audience is dramatically decreasing since the invention of emails, the web, real-time video conferences and affordable computers. In this same world the notions of self-teaching, knowledge sharing and constant connectivity are permanently present and enforceable, and will constantly shape an extropian set of values, which will guide the moral compass of this interlaced society.

Provably, there is a high societal value in shifting to a set of resilient systems, where the notion of borders, states and corporations gets blurred, if not plainly ignored when the systems lose their physicality. For that we would have to recognize the increasing obsolescence of ideological political systems and state-run systems which were built to limit social interactions by raising up physical limits and borders, which also enable and exacerbate differences, ignore interlaced culture, and/or systems that enable the ghettoiz1eation of knowledge and human-made wealth; equally we would have to recognize the high potential vicissitude of technology lords and internet's gatekeepers.

To illustrate this possible shift, the concrete example of emails becomes a relevant case study where technology, by providing a perfect substitute with higher efficiency at a marginal null cost, made the intervention of the state economically obsolete, and removed the notion of administrative borders between sender and receiver of an email. Postal services, generally run by state actors, saw their role in delivering physical letters shrink and were overtaken by an electronic mail that increased by many folds the magnitude at which messages can be sent instanteously. Emails are not perfect, but they are cheap and seamless, in that they removed the heavy investment requirements that any state-run postal service had to engage prior to the invention of telephones, fax and emails, to deliver the same service. Emails improved the perofrmance of the service in itself and limited, without directly anihilating, the role of the state in delivering a regular mail service. Thus, in today's environment, the new rulers are the unscrupulous shareholders, sitting on large reservoirs of data, and who will not necessarily consider the well-being of the served community, arguably because virtually nothing obliges them to do so. To follow-up on our example, these are the email providers who are willing to provide a free electronic service at the condition of reading your mail and programtically analyze it.

Arguably, interconnected machines can take over many of the services that state actors provide under rigid constraints, simply by providing a perfect economic substitute that does not necessarily comply with the old oragnization of things. To support this proposition, it will be enough to observe a counter-example in which the political process promotes unhinged rulers as leaders of a central power, who will certainly attempt to centralize even more administrative and technical capabilities and prerogatives, even though the technical alternatives to their power exists in its most decentralized form. Sometimes these leaders will be knowingly uninformed in regards to technology, or dangerously aware of the new capabilities, and often ignorant of the feedback loops that technology induces. In that, political ideologies remain dangerous in their incomprehension of technology, and the loss of power by the political sphere is equally threatening to the communities, as they are replaced by the data lords.

The infrastructure to interact productively, discuss the real issues facing the communities, and to challenge the ideas in public forums, exists. Simple decentralized systems, like deploying a personal email server, that would prevent commercial gatekeepers from charging a toll-fee, exist; and will provide the benefit of enticing corporations to store very little data, i.e. zero-knowldge, if they wish to serve an informed audience. Techniques to prevent state-level actors' invasive tactics, i.e. secure encryption protocols, exist.

Modern decision making process requires the acquisition of an informed technical opinion, in order to de-correlate at best the unpredictable risks of tomorrow with the necessarily partial knowledge of today. It is irresponsible to not consider the ethical repercussions of modern systems, and not reverse their ability to propagate divisiveness.

11 A COMMUNITY

DISCORDIA'S ARENA The community must protect the spaces where it can practice democracy. These must be safe spaces where individual persons can interact, and relate. The safety of these spaces necessarily emanates from their privacy.

The communities of the near future will have to face the ecological and economic risks their predecessors exposed them to. Today's communities must determine the most-at-risk populations and assess objectively the appropriate actions, arguably by educating and raising awareness for everyone else. Everyone's goal is to seek justice for the community, and for the environment.

To deliver, any democratic process must be practiced in real life, and via new systems when they are resilient, transparent and censor-less, like what the internet aspires to become. In such healthy intellectual setting, arbitrary decisions will be debunked and no truth will be absolute. Good ideas will continuously improve because they will be heavily challenged, and scholarly discussed in public forums. The infrastructure which enables such collaborative consensus mechanisms is the very network of computers that we use on a daily basis, i.e. the internet. In its ideal form, clean of any exploitation and massive data harvesting, even though un-physical and to some extent transcendental, the internet would be similar to environments that existed in numerous cultural centers over the ages, an inspiring environment perceived today in cities like Berlin. However, one must be aware of the risks laid out above, thus assess the nature of the interactions that can, or not, be exposed. Voting and other critical democratic processes, but also financial privacy and medical secrecy must be considered as utmost ciritical and must be kept in the low-tech realm because they require a level of trust that machines can't provide.

Henceforth, the communities must use their prerogatives to re-align the political and corporate incentives with mindful freedom, privacy and equality, because the politician, the technologist, and their progeniture are equally exposed to the same environment. If their house does not drown today, their children will face the angry mob, running from the floods and droughts of tomorrow. The communities must rethink the techniques with which they understand this world, as it provably is, an organic stage that can be permanently improved, or slowly destroyed, a task which will certainly require the existence of new systems, that must consider and evolve around the non-simplistic assumptions. Communities face the obligation to seek the betterment of their argumentation, apply academic reason, and equip themselves with patience and consistency. Just like forests, communities that aim to persist will have no single point of failure. By necessity, the most vulnerable member in the community, the necessary kernel, must be able to influence public policy, enjoy equal rights and equally-fair chances to create, and must be enabled to acquire the means to come up with ideas, apply them, challenge them with the value system that hosts them, and freely issue them to the communities.

The internet is also one of these potentially organic systems, and even though it is broken, it sets a motion for progress that is not limited neither in time nor in space, nor centered on a single person. It is a fertile field for ideation and thought process, if used as intended to be. To not replace a tyranny by another, communities that can thrive on the internet must actively protect these systems from power-thirsty individuals or groups of individuals, political invasive oversight and financial greed. Unlike forests, corporations and states are hierarchical human systems that promote the position of single point of failure. Thus, communities must restrain the prerogatives that the state and the corporation enjoys, and minimize their ability to coerce individual persons or groups of persons. Coercion can be active like eavesdropping on personal privacy or passive by enabling overarching financial monopolies, or by letting polluters slowly destroy the environment from which they extract their wealth, with no consequences and out of any social framework. Many of those prerogatives must be withdrawn in today’s setting for plain economic reasons, and when possible handed over to transparent resilient networks, deployed on machines kept in a secured environment, maintained (by and) under community oversight.

The infrastructure that can enable this handout exists in its very primitive version as seen with the example of emails. For instance, libre software and hardware are vivid examples of collaborative systems that are maintained by a community, while serving other communities, without necessarily infringing the integrity of those communities. People must be educated to take advantage of the "liberty" that libre software and hardware provides, and consider them as new tools whith which they can re-create their world, study, interact, shop and play freely, with no marginal costs. For sound economic and technical reasons, large technology corporations and governments are starting to shift their established systems to open-source or libre systems, since Libre software and hardware prevents technical centralization by allowing different implementations of the same software or hardware, prevents from financial profiteering and gate-keeping, and improves security and code quality.

In such a setting, arguments to restrain the omnipotent prerogatives of politicians and corporate leaders must not be foreign. The existent systems that do not relate to - and do not empower - their communities, do not tolerate any safe democratic process, and which do not actively protect their immediate environment, undermine their own future safety thus must be dismissed.

12 AN INDIVIDUAL

EDUCATED LIBERTY On the the day of writing the draft of this text, humanity celebrated the 30th birthday of the world wide web application, which was the experimental version of the web as known today. Since then, the access to academic material has never been more accessible and available for the masses of populations, at a marginally null cost. The permanent library has worked well to democratize education, but the result is far from being ideal in terms of privacy and commercial abuse.

In today's world, the youth will understand better the stakes in world's affairs because they have seamless access to material, as they will learn about mass manipulation techniques, coups d'etats, slavery, orientalism[9], colonialism and postmodern fascism, in order to build-up an immunity to these practices. Younger people will be more capable as they already consider their future roles, and are live witnesses of internet's feedback loops. They are born when information is available even for the laziest, and challengeable. They understand that the internet is a tool to communicate quickly, organize and mobilize. In contrast, none of the previous generations and cultures did interact with each other on such scale, nor interacted with their TV sets, nor their radios. In a world where we can see the street in which people walk, in real-time, even though it is at the other side of the planet, from multiple sources, it is harder for perception managers to contain the flow of data circulating in-and-out of their jurisdiction, making the unethical application of restrictive policies visibly condemnable.

To understand this world, the individual person will need to forge a sense for research and argumentation, and will have little excuse to not get informed in a critical manner, where multiple versions are assumed to be partially true. It is also a world where there is a thin intentionally-blurred line between public relations and reality, since propaganda found its way deep in a consumerist construction of society. Thus the exercise of logic[10] and linguistics[11] will be very helpful to discern between the objective reality of things, in opposition to what can be described as modern "kalam", A/B tested against samples of millions of users' psychological profiles, and applied to behavioral economics.

In this environment, the individual person must be empowered and potentially enticed to desire to be part of a community that transcends politics, consumerism and religion, and which extends its roots to englobe the history of other nations, with whom she shares humanity. An individual person will want to act upon incremental enhancements, start by improving their social context, educate themselves and their children, secure the prospects of a better setting for the future generations, and most importantly reject and fight the threat of being coerced to immigrate or accept indentured servitude.

For instance, the internet is a system that enables the individual to reach out to an oterhwise unreachable intellect forged by a collective knowledge, and where the necessary kernel is the human individual, not its center nor its sole player. It is also built to be a place where any interest-based community can thrive if it can attract and willingly assimilate a large number of persons into the community, without necessarily competing to exist or to gain market shares. The internet stands on the shoulders of new communities, rather than for-profit corporations, and is fueled by the invention of a de-facto new craft and disciplines where electronics, materials and collective collaborative creativity are combined and harnessed. Many of those communities could not have existed outside or without the internet.

It will not be easy for any person to tolerate this world without embracing its complexity. And a looser definition of communities will allow a larger flexibility to understand the motives that can drive any of these seemingly complex social groups. What one must keep in mind is that it is not necessary for a community to systemize its own structure and existence, nor aim to persist and expand over time or space. In the seemingly chaotic nature of a forest, the observer can choose to enjoy and/or ignore the bursts of life that surround him, or simply choose to level it with concrete and rigid thinking.

This world is one where any individual vulnerability will be exploited since there won't be any isolated sphere shielded from technological influence. Thereby, it is necessary to learn on acting discreetly and transparently in order to maintain and defend individual mindful freedom. It is also essential for the individual to understand and prevent the fragmentation of the social tissue into isolated intra-personal islands that can prevail over, and dictate, the definition of collective identity. Privacy and Liberty must then become obsessions to forge a common robust identity that is necessarily diverse, selectively exposed and minimally consensual.

The community will extract its identity from the many members that compose it, where each individual person will have an inclination proper to herself. If many persons share relatable inclinations, or abide by the same value system promoted by thought leaders and activists, then the ideas of the group that has the larger numbers will prevail among the community.

13 AN EPITAPH

UNGATE TO PROTECT The internet must be the safe space where humanity celebrates its higher universal intellect, and where one must be able to organize to fight collectively any form of coercion on the basis of ideology, theology, wealth or origin; if not simply scroll peacefully over giraffe pictures as the Historian would very likely suggest. This world belongs to the children of the internet, the ones that know the capabilities of their tools, and mine their knowledge from large sets of data, with the help of controlled machines that make information available from everywhere all of the time. Unlike roman baths or religious temples, the internet must be a place where all creatures are welcome.

REFERENCES

[1] Dag Nikolaus Hasse. Influence of arabic and islamic philosophy on the latin west. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, winter 2018 edition, 2018.

[2] Richard C. Taylor. *Averroes*, page 180–200. Cambridge Companions to Philosophy. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[3] M. Zalewski. *Silence on the Wire: A Field Guide to Passive Reconnaissance and Indirect Attacks*. No Starch Press, 2005.

[4] Supasorn Suwajanakorn, Steven M. Seitz, and Ira Kemelmacher-Shlizerman. Synthesizing obama: Learning lip sync from audio. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 36(4):95:1–95:13, July 2017.

[5] Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. *Communist Manifesto*. Penguin Classics, 2002 [1848].

[6] Samuel P. Huntington. The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3):22–49, 1993.

[7] Nobel Prize Committee. William d. nordhaus and paul m. romer: Economic growth, technological change, and climate change. Nobel Prize in Economics documents 2018-2, Nobel Prize Committee, 2018.

[8] Ava Kofman. Bruno latour, the post-truth philosopher, mounts a defense of science. October 2018. nytimes.com [Online; posted 25-October-2018].

[9] E.W. Said, E.W. Said, and Vintage Books (Nowy Jork). *Orientalism*. Near eastern studies : Cultural history. Vintage Books, 1979.

[10] Ludwig Wittgenstein. Tractatus logico-philosophicus. *Filosoficky Casopis*, 52:336–341, 1922.

[11] E.S. Herman and N. Chomsky. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. Random House, 2010.